

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,708	01/30/2001	Thomas H. North	483471-003	7669 .
75	590 03/26/2002			
Mark P. Levy Thompson Hine & Flory LLP 2000 Courthouse Plaza NE			EXAMINER	
			ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA	
P.O. Box 8801 Dayton, OH 45401-8801			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,,			1725	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/772,708

Applicant(s)

North et al.

Examiner

M. Alexandra Elve

Art Unit 1725



	The MAJLING DATE of this commun	nication appears on the	e cover sheet with	the correspondence address		
A SH	f <mark>or Reply</mark> ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC		XPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM		
af - If the be - If NO	nsions of time may be available under the pater SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date approved for reply specified above is less that considered timely. It period for reply is specified above, the maintaining the maintaining the proved for reply is specified above, the maintaining the	of this communication. an thirty (30) days, a rep	ly within the statut			
- Failui - Any i	re to reply within the set or extended perio	e months after the mailir		ation to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). munication, even if timely filed, may reduce any		
Status						
1) 🗆	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on		··································		
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL .	2b) This action is	non-final.	•		
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposi	tion of Claims					
414	Claim(s)	1-19		is/are pending in the application.		
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)			is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗆	Claim(s)			is/are allowed.		
6) 🗆	Claim(s)			is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s)					
8) 🖳	Claims	1-19	are subjec	ct to restriction and/or election requirement.		
	ition Papers					
	The specification is objected to by t	he Examiner.				
10)□	The drawing(s) filed on	is/are object	cted to by the Ex	kaminer.		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner.				
13)□	under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a clai All b) Some* c) None o		under 35 U.S.C	c. § 119(a)-(d).		
	1. Certified copies of the priority					
2. U Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
	 Copies of the certified copies of application from the Interest et attached detailed Office action 	ternational Bureau (P	CT Rule 17.2(a))	•		
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim					
Attach	-					
Attachm	ent(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	101	Intentions Common In	TO-413) Paper No(s).		
_	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-			ent Application (PTO-152)		
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper		Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/772,708

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claim 1-11 are, drawn to product, classified in class 219, subclass 137WM.
 - II. Claims 12-17 are, drawn to method, classified in class 219, subclass 137R.
 - III. Claim 18 is, drawn to method, classified in class 219, subclass 136.
 - IV. Claim 19 is, drawn to product, classified in class 148, subclass 23.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the electrode may be used in other joining operations.
- 3. Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are a cored electrode and method fume reduction.

Application/Control Number: 09/772,708 Page 3

Art Unit:

4. Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are a cored electrode and a ceramic composition.

- 5. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are a method of welding and a method of fume reduction.
- 6. Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are a method of welding and a ceramic composition.
- 7. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are a method of fume reduction and a ceramic composition.
- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 09/772,708 Page 4

Art Unit:

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination

purposes as indicated is proper.

10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an

election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37

CFR 1.143).

11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the

inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently

named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any

amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the

fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is (703) 308-0092.

W. ALEXANDRA ELVE PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 24, 2002.